

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION N	0.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/645,903		08/25/2000	Li Li	3361.2US (97-663.2)	6825	
24247	7590	01/20/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
TRASK BRITT				GUERRERO, MARIA F		
P.O. BOX 2550 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110		Y, UT 84110		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		,		2822		
				D. 1772		

DATE MAILED: 01/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/645,903	<b>L</b> I, LI					
navicery nearen	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Maria Guerrero	2822					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 09 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.							
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE:							
<ul><li>3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject</li><li>4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li></ul>			amendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se.	reconsideration has been consideration Sheet.	dered but does NO	T place the				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.</li> </ol>	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .  Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .  Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6,8 and 9</u> .  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> .							
The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)							
10. Other:							
		Maria Guerrero Primary Examiner January 13, 2004	ul~o				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: product-by-process claims are limited and defined by the process; determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior art product was made by a different process. In re Hirao and Sato et al., 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (CCPA 1976 (footnote 3). See also IN re Brown and Saffer, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972); In re Luck and Gainer, 177 USPQ 523 (CCPA 1973); In re Fessmann, 180 USPQ 324 (CCPA 1974); In re Marosi et al., 218 USPQ 289 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).